UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Religion at Harvard—or Any Modern College

By RAYMOND H. PALMER

A Moral Code for "Us Moderns"

By LOUIS I. NEWMAN

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART V

A New Approach to the Prohibition Question

By ROBERT WHITAKER

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 13

Chicago, December 8, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Special Announcement!

DEVERE ALLEN

Editor of "The World Tomorrow" is now in Europe and is preparing a series of six articles on

"European and International Conditions"

These articles will appear in "Unity" at intervals during the coming winter.

Mr. Allen has long been a student of international affairs, is a leader of pacifist thought in this country, and will write of European conditions as he sees them at first hand in England, France and Germany.

Subscribe Now! *$3.00 per year*

Unity Publishing Company

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 195
Religion at Harvard—Or Any Modern College! —RAYMOND H. PALMER 197
Jottings—J. H. H. 199

ARTICLES—

American Notes—Ten Church Leaders: IV—Harry Emerson Fosdick—SYDNEY STRONG .. 199
A Moral Code for "Us Moderns"—LOUIS I. NEWMAN 201
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part V 202
A New Approach to the Prohibition Question —ROBERT WHITAKER 203

POETRY—

To John Kepler—*Alfred Noyes* 195

THE STUDY TABLE—

Danger Spots in World Population—TARAKNATH DAS 205

CORRESPONDENCE—

The League of Women Voters—ERLING H. LUNDE 207
Regrets—N. I. L. 207
Important Editorials—WM. M. BROWN 207
A Model Subscriber—JOHN Q. REYNOLDS 207

THE FIELD—

"The Unsung Soldiers"—MAURICE N. EISENDRATH 207
A Manifesto to the American People by the Indian Residents of the United States of America 207
Announcement—MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD 208

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1930 NUMBER 13

TO JOHN KEPLER

(A quotation from Alfred Noyes' "Watchers of the Sky", printed here in commemoration of the tercentenary anniversary of the great astronomer who died November 15, 1630.)

Kepler is speaking to his friend, the poet:

"All that the years discover points one way
To this great ordered harmony . . .
"Revealed on earth by music. Planets move
In subtle accord like notes of one great song
Audible only to the Artificer,
The Eternal Artist. . . .
Do those fools
Who thought me an infidel then, still smile at me
For trying to read the stars in terms of song,
Discern their orbits, measure their distances,
By musical proportions? Let them smile,
My folly at least revealed those three great laws;
Gave me the golden vases of the Egyptians,
To set in the great new temple of my God
Beyond the bounds of Egypt.
They will forget
My methods, doubtless, as the years go by,
And the world's wisdom shuts its music out.
The dust will gather on all my harmonies;
Or scholars turn my pages listlessly,
Glance at the musical phrases, and pass on,
Not troubling even to read one Latin page.
Yet they'll accept those great results as mine.
I call them mine. How can I help exulting,
Who climbed my ladder of music to the skies
And found, by accident, let them call it so,
Or by the inspiration of that Power
Which built His world of music, those three laws:—
First, how the speed of planets round the sun
Bears a proportion, beautifully precise
As music, to their silver distances;
Next, that although they seem to swerve aside
From those plain circles of old Copernicus
Their paths were not less rhythmical and exact,
But followed always that most exquisite curve
In its most perfect form, the pure ellipse;
Third, that although their speed from point to point
Appeared to change, their radii always moved
Through equal fields of space in equal times.
Was this my infidelity, was this
Less full of beauty, less divine in truth,
Than their dull chaos? You, the poet will know
How, as those dark perplexities grew clear,
And old anomalous discords changed to song,
My whole soul bowed and cried, *Almighty God,*
These are Thy thoughts I am thinking after Thee!"

The three hundredth anniversary of the death of the immortal John Kepler was celebrated much more widely in Germany than in America, or in any other country for that matter! The Germans have a way of acknowledging and acclaiming activities in the realm of the mind which is not matched by any other people. Surely it is curious, a commentary on the question as to what are the real interests of men, that such an occasion as this should have passed practically unnoticed even by our American universities and scientific societies. John Kepler was one of the supreme intellects of all time and one of the half-dozen greatest scientists who ever lived. As he was the worthy successor of Copernicus, so he was the worthy predecessor of Newton. These three names together with that of Galileo constitute the immortal quartette which discovered and charted the universe in which we live today. Nothing really new was done in this field since these men died until the advent of the great Einstein, and even Einstein has not so much discovered a new universe,—Bernard Shaw to the contrary, notwithstanding—as re-charted the old. Surely the work of Kepler still stands. What Einstein is now doing to the admiration and wonder of a still bewildered world can in no way be better understood than from the standpoint of what Kepler did in noting the elliptical orbits of the planets. One feels a sense of awe in the face of such intellectual achievements as that of Kepler and his fellows which matches the awe that is stirred within us by religion. There is a blending of science and religion, of mind and spirit, in the far reaches of vision where men like Kepler and Jesus work. Einstein himself has beautifully proclaimed this fact in his recent interpretation of what he calls "cosmic faith."

It is an amazing fact that the same thing which is wrecking Hoover's administration in this country is also wrecking MacDonald's administration in England, and a still more amazing fact that this same thing is the one thing for which neither man can be held responsible. We refer, of course, to unemployment. It may be said, to be sure, that Mr. Hoover's tariff policy has immensely complicated the economic situation in America. It may be still better said that Mr. MacDonald's failure even to

try to carry out his party's program for the cure of unemployment is a just charge against the wisdom and courage of his leadership. But whatever the contribution of these two men to the situation which besets them, it still remains true at bottom that President and Premier have no more to do with the recurrence of unemployment than they do with the phases of the moon. It is this which makes so ironical their fall upon this issue. If Mr. Hoover, now, had met disaster on the clear-cut issue of the Tariff Bill, we would say that he was getting what he was entitled to receive. In the same way, if Mr. MacDonald should be overthrown because of his cruel policy in India, or his betrayal of trust in Palestine, we should say that justice had been done. But these questions have not, and will not, affect the power of either man. What has smitten both is this curious and disastrous economic slump which, under our existing system, seems like the falling of the tide to be inevitable. What their opponents, the Democrats and the Tories, are going to do about the unemployment which has undone their enemies, it would be embarrassing to ask. Of course, they will do nothing for the simple reason that they know nothing to do. But what of that? The voters are satisfied to see somebody tumble. Like the Queen of Hearts, they cry "Off with his head," and all is at once for the best in the best possible of all worlds.

We do not propose to discuss the Indian Round Table Conference in London until preliminaries have given way to finalities, and we really know something about what is actually happening, or going to happen. We may be pardoned, however, for commenting upon the opening sessions of the Conference as revealing the unexpected unity of the Indian delegates, and their uncompromising rigor in demanding dominion status for their people. The speeches at the early plenary sessions amazed the world and shocked Great Britain. Think of the spectacle of the Indian princes, long the pensioned hangers-on of the British Crown, flinging the challenge of freedom full in the face of the Premier. More remarkable still was the action of Begum Shah Nawaz, high-class Hindu woman, born and trained under the "purdah" system, in rising up in behalf of the emancipated women of India, and in their name demanding unequivocal home rule. Most remarkable was the address of the Untouchable, Bhimrao Mamji Ambedkar, himself a "scavenger," in which this pariah declared that he and his 43,000,000 fellows in India would rather take their chances in the future with Indian rulers than continue longer under the British government. These events, added to the earlier action of the Hindus and Moslems in pledging unity with one another, leaves the traditional British case without a single leg to stand on. The imperialists must now find something else to talk about; and the federal system of domestic administration, together with renewed emphasis upon the need of delay for proper evolution into independence, seems to be the switch prepared for turning the Conference on to the side-track. Meanwhile, it may be well to recognize that behind the delegates to the Round Table, speaking with their tongues, threatening with their voices, is Gandhi thousands of miles away in his prison cell. Does anyone imagine that this Conference would ever have been held had it not been for the Mahatma? And does not everyone know that the delegates, from Maharajas to Untouchable, hold the attention of Britain and the world because in them and through them are Gandhi and his silent millions? Let there be no mistake! It is the imprisoned spinner who holds in his hands the destiny of India.

The British Labor policy in Palestine has come to complete collapse. The Passfield White Paper is "a scrap of paper" cast into the rubbish heap of the world's contempt. When has a government ever been in such a condition of shame and humiliation as the Labor government in recent weeks on this Palestinian issue, especially on the day when Lloyd-George opened up all his matchless forensic artillery in the Commons, and MacDonald replied in a speech even weaker than the wishy-washy words with which he opened the Round Table Conference on India? The character of the Passfield Paper is now fully revealed as a deliberate repudiation of the pledged word of a nation. What is not revealed, and may never be revealed, is the fact as to how and why this Paper was ever published. Of course we know the miserable motive involved—to fling the Jews to the Arab wolves—and thus bind fast the loyalty of the 70,000,000 Moslems in India. No pious platitudes nor pompous protestations can hide this abomination. But there remains the mystery as to how MacDonald could ever imagine that he could "get away" with treason of this character. Did he think the Jews of the world were utterly supine, that they would not rise up against this thing? Did he imagine that there were no honest Englishmen to "cry aloud and spare not" in protest against this besmirching of their country's honor? Did he suspect that his political opponents were utterly brainless that they would not take immediate advantage of this situation? Was he so innocent as to believe that the Arabs themselves would be satisfied? But perhaps the Premier was never consulted, as has been reported, and the fault was Passfield's alone! Whatever the explanation, it still remains true that this episode involves the gravest error in statesmanship that has occurred anywhere since the close of the Great War. And that such an error, involving principle as well as policy, should have been committed by J. Ramsay Mac-

Donald and the British Labor party! That's the tragedy that has cut many of us to the heart.

There is a clergyman in New York City who is very cheerful about the hard times and the unemployment. "It's an ill wind . . . ," this seems to be the doctrine of Dr. Ralph W. Sockman. Take the church, for example! A revival of religion invariably follows upon disaster. So long as people are prosperous, happy, they are tempted to be indifferent to the things of the spirit. The things of this earth are too easily accessible, and thus offer a competition which religion cannot hope to meet. Hence, in good times, the phenomenon of empty churches! But let a war come, or pestilence and famine sweep the land, or a stock crash ruin everybody, and the soul claims its own, and the churches are full. Dr. Sockman thinks that Christianity is going to have a flourishing season this winter—much more flourishing than the theatres, the hotels, or the speak-easies. Or take divorce—the latest source of comfort for this optimistic preacher! The more prosperous is society, he declares, the more numerous are divorces. With plenty of money, people have time and opportunity for philandering—they can pay the bills of promiscuity—they can finance the expensive business of legal separation. But now all luxuries are past and gone—and divorce is a luxury. Men and women must settle down to the hum-drum simplicities of life—and nothing can be more hum-drum than marriage. So unemployment, strange as it may seem, is good for the home; it holds the family together. Therefore, the situation is not so bad, after all. Why be downhearted? All things are for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Which seems about as ironical as anything can be! And yet, from the standpoint of hard, cold fact, Dr. Sockman is unquestionably right. In the distress of hard times, as in the horror of war times, the churches are crowded. And in the next few years as compared with the last few years, the divorce rate is going 'way down. But —what kind of a world is it which makes misery a condition of virtue?

How easy it is to break the color line, to smash the barrier of race prejudice and discrimination, by a show of courage and determination, has been demonstarted anew by Clarence Darrow, firm friend of the Negro and of all men everywhere. It seems that last month Mr. Darrow was announced to speak at a great meeting in Washington, D. C. The program was a symposium in which Mr. Darrow was to explain why he is an Agnostic, Mr. Quin O'Brien why he is a Catholic, Dr. Jason Noble Pierce why he is a Protestant and Rabbi Abram Simon why he is a Jew. Shortly after the announcements were out the Negroes of Washington discovered that arrangements were being made to segregrate colored people in the gallery of the auditorium. The manager stated baldly that Negroes could obtain seats in the gallery only. Protests were immediately made to the speakers, in an effort to persuade them to withdraw from the meeting unless it were open to all people alike. None of the speakers was willing to make an issue of the matter except only Mr. Darrow, who, upon being informed of this patent violation of American principles, to say nothing of religious ideals, promptly telegraphed his denunciation to the management. Within an hour after Mr. Darrow's telegram was received, Negroes were able to buy tickets in any part of the auditorium. We are interested to note in this case that it was the Agnostic who met the issue of race discrimination without flinching. Why did Dr. Pierce, a Christian, not act? What was the reason for Mr. O'Brien's silence—he also is a Christian! Most culpable of these men, however, was Rabbi Simon. Has this man never met prejudice and hatred that he is not willing to come to the defense of another persecuted people? We feel that all three of these religious leaders, but most of all the Jewish Rabbi, owe an explanation to the country as to why they were outdone in generosity and a high sense of justice by Mr. Darrow.

Religion at Harvard—Or Any Modern College!

I suppose there are approximately five thousand persons, students and teachers, who make up the academic community at Harvard University in Cambridge. This is certainly one of the choicest groups of men, from the standpoint of both learning and character, to be found anywhere in America. There is held, in the interests of the spiritual life of this community of scholars, a service of worship each morning from eight-forty to nine o'clock. There are present at the service not one thousand, not five hundred, not two hundred and fifty, not one hundred, but perhaps as many as fifty members of the university. The President of the University is likely to be there. A saintly old man, Professor George Herbert Palmer, is generally there with his venerable brother, Frederick Palmer, the theologian. Dean Willard Sperry of the Harvard Divinity School is always there and has the supervision of the services, sometimes conducting them himself. Those are about all the professors one sees regularly at the chapel services. In addition to these there are sometimes as many as fifty students present, besides the splendid Harvard Glee Club which furnishes the lovely music for the service.

Fifty students out of five thousand! Four or five

professors out of that many hundred! And this is all that a perfectly beautiful service of worship lasting only twenty minutes can draw on the hallowed ground of Harvard college. The sermon is only seven minutes in length. It is generally preached by some very able man, a wide variety of views are presented, much liberty of speech is allowed, and, though the sermons are occasionally pompous or dull or insincere, there is on the whole a very high average of university preaching maintained so far as my limited observation has gone. The short anthem usually rendered by the Glee Club is, in my opinion, worth all the trouble of going, to say nothing of the frequently scintillating and gem-like little homilies which the preachers often present.

Nothing in all this land seems to me to be a more ominous sign for the future of liberal religion than this pitifully attended service at Appleton chapel in Cambridge. I happen to be what I suppose is properly called a radical in religious thinking. I believe that there should be perfect liberty in the expression of one's religious beliefs, and that no church does well to circumscribe the mind of the individuals. I am not an atheist, but I would gladly fellowship with those who are. I think that according to any strict definition of the term I am not a humanist in religion, but I have as nearly perfect love and charity towards those who are as I am capable of having toward anyone. But my conviction is that, when men cease to care for the inspiration and beauty and immeasurable refreshment of a service of worship, what I call religion is dying. It is dying at Harvard, and, if it dies there where they pride themselves on being liberals of the liberals, then where, in all this land, has that form of religion which waits on the ripening of maturity in the mind any chance at all to prosper?

There are plenty of things to say in extenuation of this condition. Most of what is said is very trite and means little. So we hear that it is an age of transition, that people in colleges no longer believe the dogmas of the church (as if anybody any longer supposed that they did), that psychology has shown religion to be a form of wish-fulfilment (as though that really explained anything more than would be explained if one were to say that living is just a form of breathing), or that, alas, science is taking the place of religion in the life of man and that he will henceforth be ethical but not spiritual, that word "spiritual" having been declared by some cross-eyed realists to be a "weasel word." But all these slogans of the new enlightenment turn out to be, on close examination, downright rationalizations of the unmitigated egoism of the times.

We dignify the worst tendency of the day by calling it "enlightened" self-interest. Anyone who has this, of course, does not any longer go to church and associate with those who have not. Now no psychological jargon is needed to explain why there has been such a falling off of interest in religion in America. One good old word does it, for the whole sorry business is nothing more or less than selfishness. There is terribly little enlightenment in it. There is a great deal of short-sightedness and positive obtuseness, to say nothing of the constant stream of blind rationalization.

I am not one of those who believes that the enlightened people of any age have ever taken the dogmas of religion half as seriously as we assume them to have done, that is, I mean seriously in the wooden sense and not in the sense of sincerity. But wise men in every age have understood the importance of a corporate aspirational life for the people. The history of architecture is eloquent testimony to the fact that the greatest genius of every time has found its loftiest inspiration in the idea of the temple, the chapel and the cathedral. Whenever man gets outside of himself, and begins to feel after the great ideals of love and unity for all mankind, he soon will seek a place to worship. Thus does Gandhi do a perfectly natural and, indeed, a wise thing, when he follows so scrupulously his own religion of Hinduism. I cannot believe that there are very many sincere men in America today who are staying away from worship because they are bothered by the fact that they do not believe what they hear at church. That is not nearly so large a matter as we have made it appear to be. While I believe very strongly in the necessity for every man to work out his theology, to be honest in his thinking, yet I am of the opinion that there are today many thousands of people in America who are making themselves and others believe that the reason they do not go to church is because the church is behind them in its thinking, when, as a plain matter of fact, even the rankest fundamentalism, when well stated, is far ahead of them. It is about time we ceased to dignify thoughtless individualism and rank egoism in this country by excusing it on these grounds. It is not that people have thought their way out of the church, which accounts for their absence from any kind of worship, but it is that they have used an age of changing theological conceptions as a blind for their own unadulterated selfishness.

We need a revival of religion in America. I hope when it comes it will be a bit more sane than revivals generally are, but come it surely will. It is a safe assumption that while at Harvard, for example, chapel is poorly attended, there are none the less hundreds of students there who feel the blankness of their lives and are longing for some way to get beyond themselves, so to speak. But they live in a time when it just is not the thing to do to go to a service of worship every morning. Yet how hundreds of them must, at least in their more sober moments, long to do something of that sort!

The Harvard chapel shows plainly enough that we

live in an irreligious age, and that this irreligion is not because of a breakdown of faith so much as because of an uprising of the ego. It is Max Stirner versus Jesus Christ at Harvard today as well as everywhere else in America. The next step in religion, therefore, will be what might be called a step forward that is backward, that is a return to formal public worship of God but without any compulsion as to what that term must mean to the worshiper, save that it must never mean Self.

RAYMOND H. PALMER.

Jottings

Dr. Kovarik, of Yale, has discovered that the earth is 1,852,000,000 years old. We hope that he is right about that figure 2. It would be terrible to find out in the end that the earth was only 1,851,000,000 years old!

The New York *Times* headlines:

American Bar Votes
to End Prohibition

This would seem to indicate that there is not so much difference after all between "the bar" and the "bar"!

In a public school in Santa Barbara, California, are children of every race on earth: Caucasian, Negro, Mongolian, Indian, and among these Spanish, Mexican, Filipino, Japanese, Chinese, and Hindu. "How naturally and peaceably these little ones seem to get on together," says an observer. "They march in and out of their class-rooms holding hands . . . and on the school grounds they do not gather together by races or nationalities, but mix naturally." *Except ye become as little children . . . !*

Dr. Stefani, Italian Finance Minister, has said that "Americans have much akin to the Fascisti." We remember this every time that we read of a southern lynching, but did not imagine that an Italian would want to remind us of it.

"A soft answer turneth away wrath." And a straight answer turneth away hypocrisy! As illustration, note the answer B. T. Moonje, an Indian at the London Round Table Conference, to the plea that Britain has served and fostered the interests of India. "Yes," said Moonje, "the way an Indian village serves and fosters the interests of a cow—for the sake of the milk she gives!"

We speak of the "system" of capitalism. There is no such system. There is only a mad scramble for money, like that of boys fighting for a handful of pennies. And every once in a while in this scramble, we all get hurt.

J. H. H.

American Notes

Ten Church Leaders: IV—Harry Emerson Fosdick

In Dr. Stephen S. Wise's "Ten Church Leaders" is named Harry Emerson Fosdick. He is the pastor of The Riverside Church. Thither I went. The "Sub." —the Seventh Avenue Broadway line—took me to One-hundred-sixteenth street in twelve minutes. A walk of five minutes down One-hundred-sixteenth and along Riverside Drive, and the church entrance was before me. I was passed along with the crowd to an elevator, off at the fourth floor, and after climbing over several end-men, found myself comfortably seated, in the upper balcony, ten pews from the rail.

I had gone quite early, a wise precaution—and, for half an hour there was opportunity for thought, and observation. A church calendar contains much information that I fear does not always find root in the attendants. And as I glanced about upon the windows, the ceilings, the statues in the choir, my eye was drawn to the words on the first page of the calendar:

> Of what avail these sculptured walls,
> With grace and beauty rife,
> Unless we to thine altars bring
> A dedicated life.

Among the many interesting things printed in the "Appointments" I noted that the Friends used Riverside Church for their regular meeting place. Also, that our friend H. T. Muzumdar was to speak this day before the Arts and Letters Society on "Gandhi." On Wednesday night, our friend Kirby Page was to give a lecture on "Faiths That Make Life Worth Living." The program for the week looked like that of a young university—nearly every phase of human life is touched in classroom, gymnasium, bowling alley, fellowship dinners. So far as I could see practically all the activities of Riverside Church are open to all applicants. A family living in the neighborhood could find all the culture it needed without going outside the church for it. I can think of no wiser step for an individual, or family, to take, on coming to a city like New York, than to throw in its lot entirely with a church like Riverside, or Community, or Broadway Tabernacle, or Free Synagogue, or Labor Temple, or Marble Church —places for companionship, security and culture. No one has a good excuse for getting "lost" in New York,

with such churches—and there are many others—with wide open doors swinging in.

A few words first about the building—although I am vastly more interested in the man in the pulpit. It is not complete, but is open for services and a multitude of activities. At the first service, there were present all those who had worked on the building—they and their wives. This church in architecture joins a procession of artistic churches headed by St. Patrick's and St. John's. It is standing on the left bank of the broad Hudson—literally is Riverside. Its tower in conspicuous, after the tower of the Chartes Cathedral, and rises 400 feet above the walk. Sixty-five bells in the tower will send the music of chimes over the waters of the River to the banks of New Jersey. The pulpit is supported by statues of the Major and Minor Prophets. Over the main entrance is to be seen a figure of Einstein—the only living man thus honored. This has brought much discussion and criticism. Dr. Fosdick said in the first sermon, "I hope that minds like his will come through that entrance. Scientists like him are dedicated spirits."

The sound of voices singing, at 11 o'clock, began to float up to ceilings and galleries. The processional was under way, and two score or more came in, and what do you think they were singing? Ebenezer Elliott's "When will thou save the People, Lord . . . not thrones and crowns . . . the People." And the second hymn was Whittier's "O Brother Man," and can you guess what the last hymn, the Recessional, was? Nothing less than Lowell's Stanza of Freedom, "Men who boast it is that ye come from fathers brave and free."

> They are slaves who fear to speak
> For the fallen and the weak;
>
> . . . . . .
>
> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

As Wesley's hymns got into the Established Church, so do Unitarian and Quaker hymns get through the fence!

You are ready to believe we had an impressive service? We had. It was even dramatic in places. I began to feel it coming when Dr. Fosdick said, "The Scripture Lesson will be in the 12th chapter of Luke." That particular book is crammed with Social Christianity. (The Sunday School Lessons for the first six months consist of Luke, as a text-book. One could well afford to invest ten cents in a copy and carry it around with him for a while. It is the only book in the world that contains "The Good Samaritan," "The Rich Fool," "The Rich Man and Lazarus," "The Prodigal Son," "The Pharisee and Publican," etc.)

I had noticed that the sermon was to be on "Christianity and Unemployment." It was dramatic to hear the words of the Lesson come up through this beautiful church, on the wings of Dr. Fosdick's clear voice, in the Richest City in the world,

> The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully . . . I will pull down my barns and build greater. . . . I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry. . . . Thou fool. . . . So is he that is not rich toward God.

It was dramatic that these words of the Nazarene of long ago should be read from this marble pulpit, supported by the Major and Minor prophets. And this was followed by an anthem that told us of the cross and passion needed to save.

The service was simple, full of tender sympathy, and a naturalness that one might find in a drawing room. There seemed to be nothing "affected," which is high praise to the pastor. One felt as the service moved on that the unemployment situation in the land, in the city, in his own neighborhood, had taken hold of him. It was expressed in the prayer—direct, understandable, but inspiring and ennobling, leading one to go out and do his best.

Now, as to the sermon, for which I have not left space enough. As I left the church I said to myself, "That was a great sermon. And, what is more, he will preach a greater ten years from now—for Dr. Fosdick has not reached his summit. He is still growing." This was a sermon full of quiet passion, clear thinking, fearless utterance, closing with explicit directions, coupled with a gift of grace and a will-to-do that will go with the hearer far beyond the church door.

He began by saying that he had been asked as others to speak on Unemployment. This was not his reason for doing so, but because he had been unable to get away from a scene in the New Testament described in the words, "Peter sat and warmed himself at the fire." It portrays the most subtle temptation to the church, facing the winter's tragedy of the unemployed.

> Statistics roll off our minds like water off a roof. But certain facts have lately come to me that make me realize that *individuals* are suffering. People are actually starving in this city. We prove our sincerity and interest in individuals the more we care for social conditions. How can a man care for individuals, and not care for society. This congregation has great responsibility. What a picture if we did not care! Warming ourselves at the fire!
>
> Love of comfort is a subtle temptation. We must know that we are on the edge of tragedy. What was the matter with Dives? Love of comfort, in the presence of dire need. What was the matter with the Levite and the priest! Love of comfort. We are facing a crisis—no flags, no music, no "Unknown Soldier"—as great as the crisis we thought we faced in the War. There must be similar rallying.
>
> What are we going to do about it? Little enough. First, is generous support of all agencies that are grappling with the emergency. This church, I am glad to say, has done, is doing much—we must do more, much more. Many are facing a condition of straight starvation. Further, there must be brain power put to work to solve the problem of unemployment. Even the word "unemployment" is a new word. It is a modern disease. Some of you helped to create the "machine" to produce; you are under obligation to try to solve the problems that arise from the machine.
>
> Two things I'd like to ask: Why can not we have unemployment insurance? We insure against accidents, and many other things. We have brains enough. They must be used. The second question: Why not stop saying competition is the life of trade? Why not have more social control? Why not more cooperative planning? Don't be fooled by the word "socialism," for it has been hurled against every progressive measure that afterwards went into usage. Prosperity has raised up brains in making money, instead of watching the ills. There is need of preventive methods.
>
> Peter did not always stay at the fire warming himself. When he recovered from his fright and found his senses, as later he did, he went about brave and confident proclaiming the principles of the one he had denied—an example that you should follow in his steps.

Sermon and service were wholesome, rational, inspiring and charged with motive force for those who were there. I went away saying, "At the center of this there is a fine, strong, wholesome personality—and he is greater than the Temple."

SYDNEY STRONG.

A Moral Code for "Us Moderns"

Modern men and women need a moral code to which they can hold fast and which they can teach their youth as valid and worth-while. This is a creedless and codeless, an impious age. The time has come to end the lax thinking of "us moderns" and to organize our ethical beliefs into a system. I offer the following tentative credo of moral principles as a basis of discussion:

I believe in morality as the very fulfilment of the Universal Plan which God, The Supreme Intelligence, conducts in cooperation with man. An offense against the moral law is a breach of the infinite moral unity of all life. The term in Hebraic literature *"Hillul ha-Shem"* ("Desecration of the Divine Name") and in Christian literature: "Sin Against the Holy Ghost" express in poetic language our faith that the slightest ethical error disturbs the essential spiritual harmony of the universe. Thus all morality has its sanction in religion and must be understood as the Will of the "Power that Makes for Righteousness."

I believe that morality is useful to the interests of society and mankind, and that it promotes individual and social happiness. In short, it "pays to be good" in terms of psychic and practical dividends.

I believe that the petty vices of envy, anger, prejudice, slander, ill-will and kindred failings, injure their possessor as much as their victim. They upset the emotional, intellectual and social equilibrium of all affected. They cause psychic ill-health, depression and self-disdain. They prevent the development of well-poised personalities, and undermine the foundations of collective living.

I believe that lying, cheating, deceit and trickery, whether small or great, constitute an offense against the spirit of Truth, the supremely significant attribute of God, the symbol of the unity and harmony of the Universe. Temporary success may come to the individual who practices untruth, but in the long perspective of time the structure he builds will crumble into ruins.

I believe in the sanctity of love, marriage, the family and the home. The highest happiness comes to the individual and to society through the love of one man for one woman and of one woman for one man; through their joint love for their child, and their joint effort in the family and the home on behalf of the basic values of social living.

I believe that men and women who are disloyal before marriage to the ideal love which they aspire to gain in marriage offend against the possibility of future happiness, "muddy up the stream of the emotional life" and disturb their capacity to gain the maximum joy from the life of marriage, the family and the home.

I believe that men and women who are disloyal to the vows of marriage mar the entire plan of their life. They destroy the harmonious pattern of the ideal they cherish for themselves. They offend against the health and happiness of the home. They menace the tested foundations of orderliness and unity in society.

I believe that the home is the keystone of the social arch, and that men and women should consecrate themselves to the utmost of their power to preserve, dignify and ennoble it. In some instances, it may be necessary to disintegrate a home by legal decree; but this necessity must be deplored, and regarded as a failure to attain the ideal of social health and permanence.

I believe in the power of work to develop and glorify the human brain, hand, will and soul. Men and women should not be content to think of their labor in terms of mere profit or success; they should consider it holy, and seek to direct it to the highest social and humanitarian ends.

I believe in social service and philanthropy as duties incumbent upon each person. Miserliness is an offense against the ideal of reciprocity and cooperation by which society thrives; it is a form of selfishness which sets one individual against his brothers. Generosity is a virtue which makes happy the giver and promotes social well-being.

I believe in social justice as the only rule by which men will deal fairly with each other in the fields of business, industry, politics and other spheres of human competition. The strong must not oppress the weak; the rich must not curtail the opportunities of the poor; the healthy must not ignore the stricken. Economic and international life can prosper only through exact justice in the execution of every policy. Corruption in government, like dishonesty in business, is an offense against the basic order, unity and harmony of the social structure; it "inclines the balance of the world towards evil" and threatens the entire scheme of human relations.

I believe in loyalty to the city, the state, the nation and to humanity. Patriotism must not become chauvinism: if our country's cause in a moment of crisis seems wrong, we should struggle, whatever the obstacles, to set it right.

I believe in the needlessness and horror of war. War is the supreme sin against the ideal of orderliness, law, beauty, harmony and unity in life. The statesmen and peoples of the world must so act in every detail of national and international life that situations are not created which eventuate in strife. Every war is a civil war, and cannot benefit mankind except at unnecessary cost.

I believe that each individual should so guide his moral conduct that he knows himself to be an indispensable factor in the universal program. Each deed must be done "as if the eyes of God were upon it," namely, as if it possessed direct bearing upon the preservation of the entire structure of society, humanity and the universe.

These concepts and phrases may appear to have a familiar ring. But they need repetition today more than ever. They can be improved a thousand-fold; numerous other elements can be added to them. But the dominant motif must remain the same: the moral life is the law of the Supreme Being, in which each person shares, for weal or for woe. Self-control, self-discipline, duty and responsibility are oftentimes empty words among "us moderns." But we must restore them to a central place in our thinking and acting. We must not hesitate to attempt an organization of the rules by which we seek, however inadequately, to guide our life. Soon we may find ourselves with a new Decalogue suited to contemporary needs. Then, too, we may discover that in comparison with the ancient Commandments, our own moral principles bear a striking and obvious resemblance.

(Rabbi) Louis I. Newman.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day here published for the first time in English*]

XVI

1

Nothing so delays the realization of the Kingdom of God on earth as this: that people wish to establish it by deeds which are opposed to it, by violence.

2

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

That is to say, it is better to suffer double measure from him who wrongs you, than to do such a wrong yourself to another.

3

It would seem clear that evil cannot destroy evil, but can only increase it. But, at the same time, both in accordance with our own spitefulness, and in accordance with the teaching that it is good for people to punish evil, we do the exact opposite of that which we ought; and by returning evil for evil, we only increase that of which we wish to rid ourselves.

4

That all our life is very far from Christianity is apparent from the fact that punishment is considered useful both in the bringing up of children and in the life of grown people; whereas the law of Christ bids us not only forgive, but also return good for evil. We, however, take these words as a joke, and continue to do the opposite in everything.

5

If a dog is hit or bitten by another dog, it snaps back. A man does the same thing in the heat of the moment. He wants to repay blow for blow, and he often does so. However unreasonable such actions may be for a rational man, especially for a Christian, they do a thousand times less harm than the teaching that people who do wrong should be punished. From this false teaching there arise brawls, and courts, and prisons, and executions and wars.

6

If we have to do with stone, earth or water, we expect of these things, in themselves, only that they will all be attracted to the earth. When we have to do with plants we take into account that, besides the fact that they are attracted to the earth, there is also in them a capacity to grow, to ripen, to bear seed. And, therefore, we put them in such conditions that they may have that which they need: moisture, air, sun, earth. When we deal with animals,—with cows, horses, dogs, cats and others—then besides the fact that we know they are attracted to the earth, take food, grow and multiply; we also take into account that animals have a capacity to remember, to fear and to grow accustomed to things; and therefore in having to do with them, we punish and frighten them. And hence it is clear that, in having to do with people, who are capable not only of being attracted to the earth, of taking food, of remembering and of fearing, but of thinking—we must deal differently than with stones, plants and animals. Now, this is what men forget when they use violence on people, not taking their reason into account. It is just the same as treating plants like stones, and animals like plants.

7

The foundation of the social order of the heathen was retaliation and violence, and this was necessarily so. The foundation of our Christian society, it would seem, should inevitably be love and the denial of violence. Violence, however, continues to rule. Why is this? Because that which is preached in the name of the teaching of Christ is not this teaching.

XVII

1

One of the most obnoxious superstitions lies in thinking that it is possible to force people to lead a good life.

2

It is impossible for people to improve the life of others. Every man can only improve his own life, for himself.

3

One man can understand that men in power might believe that they could order the lives of other men and that this order of theirs would be advantageous to them and their subjects. But it is amazing when the subjects themselves believe that this order in which they are willynilly placed, and which deprives them of the produce of their labor and of liberty, is advantageous and beneficial to them.

4

Only those for whom it is profitable to rule over others can believe that it is possible to order the lives of other men by violence. To people, however, who have not fallen victim to this superstition, it should be clearly apparent that the life of men can be changed for the better only by inner, spiritual changes in themselves and never by any deeds of violence which they do, or which are done to them.

5

Men desire liberty, and in order to attain it, they submit to an order of life founded on violence, which is organized for them; that is, to slavery.

6

Nothing so hinders the betterment of men's lives as their desire to better them by deeds of violence. But men's violence toward each other, more than all else, distracts them from that which alone can better their lives; namely, from striving themselves to become better.

We do not know, we cannot know in what the common welfare consists, but we know very well that the attainment of this common welfare is possible only through the fulfilment by each of that eternal law of good which is revealed to every man, both in human wisdom and in his own heart.

XVIII

1

From the superstition that men can arrange life by force for others, there arose and was confirmed the still worse superstition that men cannot live without setting one nation apart from another, and without establishing for themselves at home a power to which they must submit in all things.

2

When the law of man demands that which is contrary to the law of God, man cannot and should not obey it.

3

People fulfil the laws of man more strictly than the law of God. This, however, should not be; even because the law of God is always one and the same for all men, everywhere, while the laws of man are not only one thing in one place, and another thing in another place, but even in a given state, to-day they are one thing, and tomorrow quite another.

4

The strength of governments lies in this, that they hold in their hands both power itself and that false teaching which creates and supports power. Power makes it possible to spread the false teaching by setting aside all that is opposed to it. And the false teaching causes power, which is harmful for the people, to be counted as useful, indispensable and beneficial.

5

There is only one way to free oneself from the coils of government: not to take part in that violence by which government maintains itself.

6

When Socrates, the sage, was asked where he was born, he replied: "On earth." When they asked him to what State he belonged, he replied: "To the Universal State."

These words are great. In order that a man should not be obliged to hate people and do evil to them just because they live on a part of the earth marked off from ours, and because they recognize over themselves the power of one set of people and not of another, each man must remember that earthly boundaries and diverse powers are human matters, and that before God we are all dwellers on one and the same earth, living under the supreme power, not of men, but of the law of God.

7

In our time what are governments, without which it seems impossible for people to exist?

Even if there was a time when governments were an indispensable and a lesser evil than that which would have arisen from our defenselessness against organized neighbors, certainly they have now become an unnecessary and much greater evil than all that with which they frighten their people.

Governments might be—I shall not say, useful—but harmless, only in case they were made up of sinless holy men, as is assumed among the Chinese. But, as a matter of fact, governments, by their very activity, which consists in doing deeds of violence, are always made up of those who are the exact opposite of holy, of the coarsest, most audacious and most depraved men.

Therefore every government (but especially a government which has military power at its disposal) is the most harmful and dangerous institution in the world.

A government in the widest sense, is nothing other than an organization in which the majority of the people are in the power of the minority which dominates them; this minority, in turn, submits to the power of a still smaller minority, and this to one still smaller, etc. And so it finally comes down to several men, or in some cases, to one man. And this man, by means of military force, gains power over all the others. Such a man is always one who is more cunning, more audacious, more unscrupulous than all the rest, or the heir of those who were more cunning and more unscrupulous.

And at the disposal of such men is put full power, not only over the life and property, but over the spiritual and moral development, over the education and religious guidance of all people.

People set up for themselves this terrible machine, power; and they let the first-comer seize it, with all probability in favour of its being seized by the man who is morally vilest. And they slavishly submit to him who has fallen into power, and are surprised that they fare badly. People are afraid of infernal machines, of anarchists; but they do not fear this terrible organization, which every moment threatens them with the greatest calamities.

8

Government organization is especially harmful in that it is always arrayed in outer grandeur, and through this inspires respect for all the crimes committed by government, thus perverting the judgment of the people.

[To be continued]

A New Approach to the Prohibition Question*

Some years ago, when the Russian Revolution was younger than it is today, I held a public debate in Los Angeles with Dr. Arthur Briggs, a lawyer of that city and at the present time head of the Metropolitan Law School there. The subject of the debate was the probable course of social change in the western world. Dr. Briggs maintained that such change, however revolutionary in its total effect, would not follow the lines of the Russian Revolution because of the contrasting conditions as between Russia and western nations. I maintained that whatever the superficial differences social revolutions follow the same main lines everywhere

The French Revolution of 1789 and the Russian Revolution of 1917 occurred more than a century apart, and in otherwise very variant situations, yet bore the same general characteristics. These characteristics were present in the Mexican Revolution of 1857, more completely consummated in this century. They will be found also in a study of the Fascisti Revolution in Italy within recent years. And although less manifest in our own milder revolutionary experiences the main landmarks are present in our revolt against Great Britain in 1776, the revolt against the slave oligarchy in 1860, and the revolt against the saloon which led to the present prohibition law.

Four steps are plainly visible in all these social upheavals, and are bound to be present where any profound social change occurs. The first of these is dissatisfaction, to the point of explosion, with an established order. The second is the expropriation of privilege, as against the oppressive order. The third step is the rise of a counter-revolutionary movement. And the fourth step is the establishment of a dictatorship on the one side or the other.

*An address delivered before the Open Forum, Los Angeles, California.

Space will not allow here a particular study of the more obviously revolutionary movements first named, in France and in Russia. But the four steps indicated are evident enough there without extended argument. The conditions in both instances had become intolerable. The work of expropriation was forced upon the revolutionaries after all manner of milder expedients had been tried, and failed. On both occasions the expropriated fled to the border and called in foreign aid to back them in their counter-revolutionary effort. Likewise in both instances a dictatorship followed, shifting back and forth in the case of France, but eventually balancing to the side of the new order. In less obvious measure these things were also true in Mexico, where the old order had become intolerable, where appropriation was made part of the new constitution, and where eventually, after much counter-revolutionary activity, the balance of power has fallen to the progressive side, in a qualified degree. In Italy the steps were substantially the same, except that the dictatorship has thus far inclined to the conservative side.

Our own experiences, as already indicated, were less profound in character, as revolutions go. Nevertheless the marks of the same processes are there. The old order had become unworkable as between Great Britain and the colonies, and as between the North and the South. Meliorative measures had been tried, and failed, because as in all instances where special privilege and vested interests are involved the established order will yield nothing substantial. Consequently the party of progress was forced to a program of expropriation. Counter revolution in these instances took the form in the main of outside opposition, but was not lacking, as a closer study would show, on the home field. The finality was dictatorship on the successful side.

The Prohibition law in the United States came about so gradually that these steps are less visible in the process than with respect to the other movements considered. But it is no forced analogy which finds them there. Dissatisfaction with the reign of the saloon was first manifest in the religious field, and particularly in that part of the religious field where salvage work was more evident and aggressive, that is among the evangelical churches. But it was also present with social reformers of various schools. It became acute in the Southern states through the pressure of the race conflict there, and in the North through the rise of mechanical systems like the great railways and the advance of industrial efficiency.

Many and devious devices of a conservative character were tried to meet the situation. The first temperance advocates were content to preach moderation. The ineffectiveness of this program drove them to total abstinence crusades. As yet the appeal was altogether to the individual, and to the drinker rather than the drink seller. Then followed the appeal of the Woman's Crusade, in the effort to convert rum sellers through prayer meetings held upon the sawdust floors of the saloons. The inadequacy of all of these measures forced upon the temperance people anti-liquor legislation, at first of a mildly regulative character, finally after more than a century of futile compromises of a prohibitive and expropriative character. The old saying, "For where the vanguard is today the rear shall camp tomorrow," is strikingly illustrated in the fact that the opponents of Prohibition now are noisily enthusiastic for programs which they scouted as impossible and fanatical less than half a century ago. If there is any exception to this remark it is on the side of government ownership and control, and that is a program to which the "wets" as a whole have by no means consented, and to which they will not consent except where they are assured that liquor will be less controlled by the government than the government will be controlled by liquor.

The third step is obvious enough as to the anti-liquor revolution, the counter-revolutionary movement. But the lines which this movement has followed, and the reasons for the present strength of the anti-Prohibition forces are not so clear. A brief review of the facts may serve to clarify them.

The situation thirty or thirty-five years ago in the United States showed on close observation a sinister alliance between the vendors of vice, including as chief promoters among these the saloons, and the purchasers of special privilege. The big corporations wanted civic and county and state administrations who could be bought up in the interests of unsocial franchises and other concessions of a privately profitable character, and in order to get and keep such governments stood in with the saloons and their allies in the underworld. With the advent of Prohibition the balance of power shifted from the expropriated liquor business to such powerful political organs as the Anti-Saloon League and the churches. Church advertising also contributed to throw conservative favor as voiced through the newspapers to the anti-liquor side. Big Business has therefore found it good policy in the main to kill two birds with one stone, to get rid of the liquor monopoly which was of doubtful advantage to business, and to get the support of the churches for social conservative and even reactionary policies through the election of "political drys."

This indirect alliance of the "drys" with social reaction has alienated a large body of liberals and progressives both inside and outside of the churches who have been repelled by the extent to which the anti-saloon forces have sacrificed the whole body of social reconstruction to their own campaign against one particular vice and institution. On the other hand, the liquor traffic, always and irreclaimably lawless, has taken advantage of the general reactions of the after-war period, and the large body of illicit trade to be capitalized on their side, and has made tremendous steps toward that organization of lawlessness as a business which is a natural sequence both of the war violence and of the whole movement within the commercial world toward efficient consolidation and aggression. Counter-revolution has also had the aid of vast bodies of outside capital, and of an anti-Prohibition sentiment in other nations. The wonder is not that it has attained such strength, but that Prohibition has been able to maintain itself as well as it has.

This it must be admitted is yet the case because of the continued alliance between Big Business as represented most conspicuously in the Republican Party, and the political leaders of Prohibition. The alliance in some cases, as in Illinois, has been scandalously immoral and anti-social at times. It is breaking down at both ends now. The awakened conscience of social progressives in the churches has refused to stand for the implicit assumption of the more fanatical Prohibitionists that nothing else mattered much in legislation except to outlaw the saloon. On the other

hand, a powerful coterie of big business men today are so anxious to evade inheritance taxes and income taxes, and put the weight of these upon the common people, that they are exerting themselves to the utmost to overthrow Prohibition and in some form or other get the revenues of the nation tied up with a licensed liquor business. Their success would mean, in the inevitable play of compromise, that special privilege and social reaction would work both groups for support and would get it. The liquor folks would sacrifice social reformatory legislation in order to draw as heavily as possible from the Big Business world, and the anti-liquor folks, by like necessity, would be compelled to play up to the same sinister social forces in order to attract their support. The reactionaries would hold the bag, and pay out their support, financial and otherwise, to the one side and the other as they do to the labor forces now.

There is but one way out for Prohibition if it is to win a final and decisive victory. A party solely and wholly devoted to Prohibition of liquor cannot in the stress of our industrial and commercial situations hold the main line in the political field. The Labor issue, to summarize the social movement as such, is bigger than the liquor issue. Either side that falls for a narrower program, Prohibition or anti-Prohibition, will be inevitably betrayed into alliance with special privilege and industrial ineffectiveness. Either Prohibitionists must follow the logic of their revolutionary procedure against liquor, and outlaw and expropriate the whole order of exploitation which is driving civilization to self-destruction, or else the forces of social democracy will sweep them aside. If Prohibitionists force this repudiation of them by the social reformers and revolutionists of the world they will not only harm their own cause, they will do serious damage to the cause of the new social order by forcing it into disastrous alliance with a business which is always and everywhere faithless and inimical to the public good. Progressives within the churches and outside the churches cannot afford to divide on this issue, and much less can either contingent afford to stand with the liquor traffic.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

The Study Table

Danger Spots in World Population

Professor Warren S. Thompson, Director of the Scripp Foundation for Research in Population Problems at Miami University has made a very substantial contribution to the cause of the World Peace in his work "Danger Spots in World Population."* The author has not discussed the population problem in a conventional and orthodox manner; but has tried to show its relation to world peace. Those who are genuinely interested in world peace will find the book most interesting and instructive. Students of international relations cannot afford to miss reading it, since it presents a clear, dispassionate and scientific study of one of the chief factors which lead to wars.

Some of the important conclusions of Professor Thompson's study are as follows: (a) A nation, through pressure of population and to secure means of subsistence, is forced to seek territorial expansion, which often leads to war. (b) Control of population pressure, through the practice of birth control, is one of the surest means of aiding the cause of world peace. But it is certain that in the very countries where the pressure of population is the greatest—such as Italy, Japan, India, China—the idea of birth control cannot be enforced effectively within several decades, even through legislation. (c) World peace cannot be maintained for many years on the basis of *status quo.* (d) For the re-adjustment of population pressure, and to avoid wars, those nations which have acquired vast territories (by using force and dispossessing other nations) and are not in need of these territories and for many reasons are not able to develop them for the good of the world at large, should be willing to give up some of the undeveloped lands to those nations which are in need of them and are able to develop them through colonization. (e) Unless this is done the present *status quo,* which is based upon "force system" of various imperialist powers, will be overthrown by those nations whose very existence will demand readjustment in their favor. This will be brought about by new alignment of powers, through the activities of Japan, Italy, China, India, Germany, and other nations, which are under the pressure of population and feel that they are being unjustly treated by the land-grabbing powers, especially Great Britian and France. (f) Great Britain is anxious to maintain the *status quo* in the western Pacific, and is doing her best to secure American support. The United States of America has nothing to gain, from the standpoint of economic interests and world interests, by aiding Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand against Japan, China and India.

Professor Thompson makes the most important contribution to the cause of international peace and justice when he asserts that the *status quo* or the control of the undeveloped countries by various western nations, may have legal sanction, but has no real moral and ethical sanction. The present policy of the powers possessing vast undeveloped territories, and which keep other peoples from developing them, has been justly characterized as a dog-in-the-manger policy. Professor Thompson is not an up-holder of the "White Australia" or "White Africa" policy, because he thinks that there is no moral justification for it. Furthermore such a policy will lead inevitably to war. He writes:

> One of the chief arguments in justification of the white man's exploitation of new lands has always been that he needed new lands and larger resources and that the natives in large part of the earth were not using their lands and resources as well as he could; hence he felt that he was entitled to take control of them and put them to use. He is now finding that there is some truth in the homely expression that *"chickens come home to roost."* The same argument for the better, more complete use of lands would certainly justify the Oriental peoples in taking the lands which the white man is not using as well as they could. (Pages 163-164.)

Professor Thompson carries his theory further and comes to a conclusion which may be regarded by the orthodox students of international law and international relations as very revolutionary. To him it seems that when a nation is under the pressure of

*Danger Spots in World Population, by Warren S. Thompson. Published by Alfred A. Knopf. New York City.

population and needs new territory for the very subsistence of its people, and other nations, which possess surplus territories which they do not need and are not for various reasons able to develop, refuse to make peaceful re-adjustment of territories in favor of the former, then, if this situation leads to a war, the power which is under population pressure should not be held morally responsible for aggression. He writes:

It is an interesting kink in our notion of international ethics that aggression is condemned indiscriminately, apparently because it is aggression, while the maintenance of *status quo,* which may work untold hardship on millions of people, seems to have general approval. It is, of course, to the interests of the peoples who have all they want to throw the onus of moral responsibility for war on those who have little, and would, therefore, necessarily be the ones to initiate a struggle for a change of the *status quo.* But we should have arrived at sufficient knowledge of the methods and conditions of the acquirement of lands in past times, to prevent mere possession from creating in our minds an unshakable presumption of moral right to hold them under any and all conditions. (Page 238.)

Population pressure in Italy is so serious that it may disturb world peace unless new outlets are found for Italian immigration and colonization. To satisfy Italy's need Great Britian and France should make some concessions to her. France should arrange that Italy may acquire control over Syria, and Britian should allow Italy to secure possession of Iraq. Professor Thompson thinks

if in addition to the acquisition of Syria and Iraq, the immigration policy of Australia and South Africa were so changed so as to admit considerable number of Italians, the pressure in Italy would be relieved. . . .

Japan, India and China will need territories for expansion. At the present Japan's need is the most urgent, and China's need is the least pressing. Japan needs territories where her surplus population may colonize. It has been proven conclusively that Manchuria or Korea is unsuitable for Japanese colonization; therefore, the Japanese should have the opportunity in warmer countries. Professor Thompson makes the bold suggestion that the tropical part of Australia, which cannot be colonized by "white men," should be given to Japan for the purpose of colonization. He further suggests that Britain, Australia and Holland should agree that Japan should be given possession of New Guinea.

Chinese population expansion is quietly but effectively going on in the Malay Peninsula, India-China, Siam and Dutch colonies. Southward expansion of Chinese population is the logical solution of her population problem.

To relieve population pressure in India, Great Britain should encourage Indian immigration to Africa, especially in East Africa (particularly Kenya). British authorities and British residents in Africa are opposed to Indian colonization in East Africa and they often pretend that Indian immigration should be discouraged for the purpose of protecting the natives (Negroes) from exploitation. It will be worthwhile to take careful consideration of Professor Thompson's views on this subject. He writes:

It seems not unlikely, then, that this theory of trusteeship which is particularly applied to Africa is only a cloak under cover which other interests can be served. This cloak also apparently hides from the conscience some of the true motives and thus renders it quiet in the face of the conduct that might disturb it if they were clearly and nakedly revealed. To the Oriental this certainly appears to be so. He sees in the history of the West during the last five hundred years or more a constant denial in conduct of the theory that lands should be preserved for the use of those who happen to live in them.

It appears to the man in the East that the Westerner has never hesitated an instant to dispossess the natives of any land he has wanted for his own use. If he has not wholly driven out the natives or exterminated them, he has enslaved them as far as possible and made them serve him. The theory that he derives from the European's conduct as pictured in his history of expansion is that the only right is might. Nothing but force seems to him to count in the determining of the European's relations to the other peoples. Thus, if the Oriental feels that the theory of preserving the lands of African Negroes for them in the future is merely a high-sounding phrase devised to cover their exploitation solely by the Europeans, we can scarcely be surprised. Often it is not pleasant to see ourselves as others see us, and particularly is this true if the others are not properly appreciative of the values for which our civilization stands. (Page 164.)

. . . . . .

The fact is that at the present time *every* Indian is a potential agitator against Great Britain. As such he is not a desirable immigrant, because if such people become numerous, the white man's grip on this part of the world (Africa) is certain to be loosened. . . . Underlying all objections to the settlement of Indians in East Africa is, as we have tried to make clear in this discussion of the reasons usually given, the feeling that their presence spells the end of white exploitation in this part of the world in the not distant future. Economically the white man cannot compete with the Indian in a new tropical country. The modes of living and standards of consumption of the Indian are so low that they can best the white man in open competition. Furthermore, the Indian outbreeds him so rapidly that even if comparatively few were admitted, they would soon greatly outnumber him, and since they are not so docile and so easily managed as the Negroes, they do not furnish good material for long continued exploitation. (Page 170.)

. . . . . .

The settlement of East Africa by the Indians would, then, appear to be one of the ways of easing the strain in India and would also provide for the settlement and use of this now almost vacant land by one of the neediest of peoples. . . . There is, therefore, reason to think that an outlet for the Indians as great as that of East Africa would very materially help in solving India's population problem. Throwing this area open to Indian settlement would most certainly contribute largely to a better understanding between Great Britain and India and thus render the Indians less likely to disturb the present balance of power than they will otherwise be. (Pages 180-181.)

In the past almost all western scholars ignored the rights of the people of the Orient to expand. They thought of preserving world peace in terms of maintenance of "white supremacy" and "exploitation of the so-called backward peoples." It is most gratifying that Professor Thompson brushes aside this double standard of morality in international relations and suggests that

unused lands and resources in the world should be regarded as a means of satisfying human needs rather than as prizes to be kept solely for the profit of the peoples who happen to hold them at the present moment. Only when this comes to be the general attitude of the great powers may we expect that Japan and other sorely pressed nations will cease to have any interest in creating troubled conditions from which they may possibly derive some profit. But until the nations holding excess resources reform, we cannot expect any considerable change in the conduct of the nations which are suffering from the lack of resources.

In conclusion Professor Thompson makes the constructive suggestion that the existing "force system" in international relations should be modified through international co-operation. An international committee should be organized for this purpose. This committee, among other things, should carefully study problems of pressure of population in various lands and examine the need of nations seeking for new territories and supply of raw materials. This committee's impartial reports will help in creating public opinion in favor of peaceful adjustment of international problems which will eliminate possibilities of wars.

TARAKNATH DAS.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

"The Unsung Soldiers"

John Milton's lovely words "Peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war" is not merely splendid poetry but sober fact as well, although it is all too seldom that we mortals pay any heed to the unsung soldiers of the daily life and to their noble victories of peace. While the military hero is everywhere applauded and honored, feted in life and reverenced in death, the uncounted millions who in times of peace silently and humbly sacrifice and serve their fellowmen are indifferently forgotten and callously scorned. These miners who descend into the dark, dank bowels of the earth, prey to poison gasses and dangerous explosives that we might be warm 'mid winter's icy blasts; these scientists laboring day and night in their laboratories, scornful of the insidious germs of dread diseases that we might enjoy health and length of days; these engineers that guide their sleeping passengers through the night, fearless of the wrecks which might lurk ahead; these sailors steering their plunging and pitching vessels through storm tossed seas, heedless of the rocks and reefs that lie before; policemen who, undaunted by gangsters and bandits, bravely and silently walk their lonely and monotonous beats that law and order might prevail; firemen who, without a moment's hesitation, rush into blazing buildings to succor some life from the ravenous maw of the greedy flames; nurses, who tend the sick; mothers who die that another might live. Behold this host of courageous soldiers serving without "the roll of stirring drums and the trumpet that speaks of fame," unsung soldiers all who likewise "lay down their lives for their friends,"—an army counting its casualties in tens of thousands—an army that endures both trial and tribulation, privation and pain, an army "that serves without intermission and knows no armistice, and yet an army forgotten, unhonored and unsung."

It was therefore as an humble endeavor to pay some slight homage to this noble and neglected army fighting and sacrificing in the cause of peace that a small band of men and women, members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, gathered on the morning of Armistice Day in Mount Pleasant Cemetery, Toronto, to lay a wreath of flowers upon each of the graves of five heroes of social construction: A policeman, fireman, an industrial worker, a physician and a nurse. There, in the early morning watch, words of appreciation were uttered by men representing various faiths and different walks of life. Ministers of the United and Baptist Churches, an Anglican Archdeacon, a Rabbi, a Labor Member of the Board of Control, and likewise, though in absentia due to illness, the Archbishop of the Catholic Church. Thus were joined as only before in time of war—Catholic, Protestant and Jew, Capitalist and Laborer—in this solemn and impressive gesture toward peace.

None who attended the service there in God's silent acre but was deeply stirred by the dignified and earnest service. None who heard the fervid words there uttered but prophesied the growth of such an inspired and inspiring movement. Nor can peace be assured until men recognize the truth of the poet's words regarding the victories of the daily life. A multiplicity of causes make for war, it is true, but none is so potent as the dissatisfaction of peace and the idealization of war. Only as the imagination of men and women be so captured by the heroisms of peace will lasting good will upon earth be achieved. An humble start was made in this direction at Mount Pleasant Cemetery in Toronto last Armistice Day, when everywhere else men's minds were being stirred once more by military glory and martial splendor. Though its beginning be small, perchance its latter end may become exceedingly great. May the day soon come when the praise of the unsung soldier will resound from one end of the earth unto the other, when in the noble cause of peace—than which there is today none nobler—all faiths, creeds and classes might be again united and peace, God's most precious gift, be vouchsafed unto all the sons of men.

(Rabbi) Maurice N. Eisendrath

A Manifesto

to the American People by the Indian Residents in the United States of America

Today India is facing the most important crisis in her relationship with England. The press of the United States is carrying first page articles of the events happening daily in that ancient and noble country.

For the past hundred and fifty years we have existed under the crushing yoke of a foreign imperialism. To justify their brutal autocracy, they have employed the most efficient system of veiled, insidious, and pernicious propaganda. The world has been led to believe that the exploitation and plunder of one-fifth of the human race is a blessing of the British Raj.

The Indian National Congress—the Nationalist representative body —(founded about forty-five years ago)—meeting at Lahore, Punjab, during the last days of December, 1929—has voted for Complete Independence for India "by peaceful means if possible, by force if necessary."

We, the Indian residents in America, sharing the same views with our fellow-citizens at home, feel it our

Correspondence

The League of Women Voters

Editor of Unity:

"Ten Years of Woman Suffrage!" Page 101, Oct. 27, 1930, issue.

Whoever wrote this has not been watching the activities of the "League of Women Voters." Here is a real live group of women doing a bang-up job. They just put over "Women in Juries" in Illinois against tremendous odds, have fought valiantly for Government operation of Muscle Shoals and many other worth-while projects. They are building slowly, but well. Men have had hundreds of years to bring about this mess. Just give these women time. They are not the ordinary Woman's Club that passes a resolution and then forgets all about "following through." No, not this group! Get acquainted with their program and see how they get out and work for it.

Wake up! Where have you been!

Erling H. Lunde.

Chicago, Illinois.

Regrets

Editor of Unity:

It will be impossible for me to renew my subscription at this time. I am sorry, because I have enjoyed Unity very much. Some of the articles make the reader feel that he is "in" or "on the inside" on the making of world history, epoch making events.

I hope I may be able to subscribe again soon.

N. I. L.

Important Editorials

Editor of Unity:

There are two important editorials in the November 17th issue of Unity—the one about Russia and the other about Einstein. Please send me as many copies as the enclosed one dollar will pay for. I am very fond of good editorials and Unity often has the best I see for the week.

Galion, Ohio. Wm. M. Brown.

A Model Subscriber

Editor of Unity:

I am sending check for my renewal, and sending a new subscription which I solicited today after church. . . . When I renewed a year ago I wrote you asking for the names of other Unity subscribers here and you informed me that I was the only subscriber in Glens Falls. A pretty lonesome state of affairs! This new subscription will make 100 per cent increase in Glens Falls and I hope you may have a like gain everywhere.

I come nearer to reading the entire contents of Unity than any other paper or magazine I take. . . .

Your recent article by Zona Gale, "A Tolstoyan Grand Duke," was most interesting. Please let us have more along this line. . . . It is these unusual features that we get in Unity that make us love it.

Yours with best wishes and hopes for a growing subscription list.

John Q. Reynolds.

Glens Falls, N. Y.

duty to issue the following declarations:

1. We have never been conquered. Great Britain has usurped India. She has robbed, cheated, murdered, bribed, and massacred. She holds India for the good of the Empire. Her claim that it is her "sacred trust" is a farce.

2. When she came to India we were a happy, prosperous, and sovereign people. Her application to trade with India, written to the Moghul Emperor discloses the relative positions of the two nations at that time:

"The humble supplication of John Russell (agent of the company) who is as the minutest grain of sand, and whose forehead is the tip of His footstool, who is the absolute monarch and prop of the Universe, whose throne may be compared to that of Solomon, and whose renown is equal to that of Cyrus. . . . The Englishmen, having traded hitherto in Orissa and Behar, custom free, are your Majesty's most obedient slaves, always intent upon your commands. . . We have readily observed your most sacred orders, and have found favor; we have, as becomes servants, a diligent regard for your part of the sea... we crave to have your Majesty's permission in the above mentioned places, and to follow our business without molestation."

3. Now she has thrown us into the ranks of enslaved races. We are insulted, discriminated against, and looked down upon—at home and abroad.

4. The oppressed people groan under the domination, and are reduced to the extremities of wretchedness. Technically, we pay no tribute to the Caesars, but the land is being drained of untold millions in the salaries paid to her pro-consuls, civil and military officials, and pensions to their relatives at home in England.

5. We have no voice in the government. Taxes are levied without representation, and fall heavily, most heavily, on the silent masses. Forty-eight per cent of these taxes are spent for the upkeep of a large standing army, beyond all proportion to the needs of the country; 28 per cent is spent on railways of British Control—built at strategic points to rush troops to crush Nationalist spirit; and only 2 per cent is spent on the combined departments of (1) Education; (2) Public Health; (3) Sanitation; (4) Agriculture; (5) Irrigation; (6) Scientific Research; (7) and Industrial Development.

They have taxed even salt, a poor man's food, required alike by man and beast—free of taxation in all civilized countries. It brings them 100 per cent profit; $30,000,000 annually to further their imperialistic designs. While we starve, England fills her coffers with gold. In the words of Hon. G. K. Gokhale—an Indian patriot—"She stands guard at the front doors of India, while stealing the wealth from out the back doors."

6. She has wrecked our industries, in favor of her own. British manufactured goods have flooded the land. The awakened and wronged Indian nation is now making bonfires of foreign cloth in just protest.

Her motto is *"divide et impera"*; this causes the religious riots, race riots, caste riots, etc.; our social evils exist, but are no worse than those of the rest of the world. Because of them she has so slandered us that we are considered even less than human beings.

7. England has cursed us with opium and liquor traffic. She is engaged in this nefarious trade to collect large revenue. Where we would plant cinchona trees, she is growing coca for the manufacture of Cocain Hydrochloride—the deadliest habit forming drug—urging the cultivation against the spirit and letter of International agreement—of which she is a signatory. For one year the opium revenue to England from India was over $12,000,000.

8. She does not keep her promises to us. For her, all things are fair, in war and spreading the dominion. For our services in the world war, which we helped to win by men, money and supplies—instead of the self-government she promised—we were rewarded with the infamous Rowlatt Acts; the Amritsar massacre of 1919. . . .

9. Epidemics—plague, cholera, dysentry, malaria, smallpox, and a host of others—annually visit the unhappy land. Millions are swept away like autumnal leaves before a gale. The English government does nothing to check their ravages. Nay, when the cholera commission, under Robert Koch, succeeded in discovering cholera vibrio the causative agent of Asiatic cholera—he was shipped away quietly, the matter was hushed up, lest English shipping suffer—and the discovery was not made public until ten years later.

She tells the world we are illiterate. Is not she to be blamed for it? She could have made Education compulsory over night—and our universities would have been the Mecca for scholars, as in the days of yore.

Famines are endemic. It is not our fault. The more we grow, the more we are made to pay in taxes—and we are left with nothing to eat, and but a loin-cloth to cover our starved bodies.

10. In the present struggle she has clamped down on all news from India. She has arrested Mahatma Gandhi, by an ordinance of 1827—more than one hundred years old—"Which," says A. J. Muste, Labor Member of Parliament, "is one of the major tragedies of our era." . . .

In face of these and countless other grievances, we lay our case before the world, and especially before the Great American Nation. India is the keystone of the British Empire. She means to keep it at all cost. She has grossly misrepresented us in the past, and has redoubled her efforts in that direction at the present.

We are not barbarians, savages, or even backward people—as has been given out to the world. We are not against modern machinery, and do not intend to return to primitive methods. We are not anti-foreign, or anti-Christian. We are simply demanding the right to rule our own home.

The United States of America, assisted as she was by other nations in her struggle, has always championed the cause of those struggling for their Freedom.

As our friends we appeal to you. We do not want to inveigle America into our fight; but we do want you to understand India and her problem, believe in her just cause, and, because of your sacred traditions, assert your influence.

Published by India Independence Central Committee, Nur M. Malik, M. D., President, 660 Josephine St., Detroit, Mich., U. S. A.

Announcement

Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead has just begun a month's lecture tour in the West in the interest of international friendship. She will give several addresses in Cleveland and Toledo and speak in Ann Arbor and Detroit and other cities in Michigan, then spending a week in Chicago. She will give addresses at Beloit College and at Indianapolis and Lafayette in Indiana; and on her return way to Boston she will speak in Buffalo, Rochester and other cities in New York. In Chicago Mrs. Mead will stay at Hull House.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

IN DECEMBER

The holidays, with their rounds of entertainments and festivities, make extraordinary demands upon evening wardrobes. While here is a service which can be depended on to beautifully cleanse and condition each dress garment entrusted to its care.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue